

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Independent claims 1, 11, 21, 27, and 29 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Applicant incorporates herein by reference previous responses in so far as they remain applicable to current grounds of rejection.

Most but not all claims stand rejected over Butler (US 2002/0007493), yet the text of the rejections rely on Mankovitz. It is assumed this Butler reference is in error and the claims are intended to be rejected under Mankovitz. Notwithstanding this, Butler does not, it is submitted, teach or suggest the claims as amended.

Regarding the rejections generally, the claim amendments include clarifying that every independent claim series requires that a local copy is stored of web content associated with video information to allow arbitrary access thereto after a broadcast of said video information even after such web content might be removed from the web. As will be appreciated by the Office, web/Internet content is ephemeral and may disappear quickly if not immediately after a broadcast. The current claim embodiments overcome this limitation by reciting that a local copy of the content is stored so that the web content may be arbitrarily accessed after a broadcast. This arbitrary access after a broadcast, even if the original content may have been removed from its original web

source, was what was intended by the original limitation "retrieving said web content." It is believed the current amendments clarify this inventive intent.

Applicant submits that nowhere does Mankovitz teach or remotely suggest the amended storing a local copy of the web content as recited. Thus, even if we assume for argument the Office is correct that Mankovitz teaches time shifting video in the same manner as performed by Applicant, such time shifting of video playback does not even remotely suggest the recited local copy of web content to protect against subsequent removal of the web content after the broadcast.

Mankovitz, at best, allows one to temporarily pause playback as noted by the Office to provide time to access associated web content. Mankovitz does not teach or suggest archiving that web content to completely time-shift access to both the broadcast and the associated web content as is claimed in the amended embodiments.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit all rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

INTERVIEW REQUEST

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if the foregoing amendments are deemed unpersuasive in order to discuss how to best proceed with continued examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 3, 2005



/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

3 FEBRUARY 2005
Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGHAM
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

[Signature] 2-3-05
Signature Date